United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

	No. 11-2878
Timothy LaPlez Davis,	*
Appellant,	*
,	* Appeal from the United States
V.	* District Court for the Eastern * District of Arkansas
Paul Owens, Jail Administrator,	* District of Arkansas. *
Fordyce, AR,	* [UNPUBLISHED] *
Appellee,	*
Tim Stewart, Officer,	*
Fordyce County Jail,	*
Defendant,	* * *
Michael Key, Originally Sued As	Key, *
Appellee.	*
	nitted: January 5, 2012 Filed: January 25, 2012
Before LOKEN, BYE, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.	

PER CURIAM.

Inmate Timothy LaPlez Davis appeals the district court's adverse grant of summary judgment in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Upon de novo review of the record, see Holden v. Hirner, No. 10-3656, 2011 WL 6004085, at *2 (8th Cir. Dec. 2, 2011) (standard of review), we agree with the district court that there were no trialworthy issues on Davis's failure-to-protect claim, see id. at **2-3 (to establish prison officials failed to prevent harm, inmate must prove he was incarcerated under conditions posing substantial risk of serious harm, and defendants knew of and disregarded excessive risk to inmate's safety, i.e., they recklessly disregarded known risk); or on his claim arising from the medical care provided for injuries he sustained in the altercation with another inmate, see Christian v. Wagner, 623 F.3d 608, 612-13 (8th Cir. 2010) (pretrial detainee must show he suffered from objectively serious medical need which defendants knew of, yet deliberately disregarded).² The judgment is affirmed, and we grant appellees' motion to strike the new document in the addendum to Davis's reply brief. See Griffin v. Super Valu, 218 F.3d 869, 871 (8th Cir. 2000) (declining to consider documents that were not before district court when summary judgment ruling was made).

¹The Honorable Joe J. Volpe, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§ 636(c).

²We decline to address issues that Davis has not sufficiently addressed in his brief. See Blakley v. Schlumberger Tech. Corp., 648 F.3d 921, 933 (8th Cir. 2011).